

MEMORANDUM FOR: Special Assistant to the DD/I  
SUBJECT: The IG Survey of Foreign Intelligence Collection Requirements  
REFERENCE: Memorandum from Addressee, 10 March 67, requesting comments on a proposed restatement of recommendations

1. This Office views the report as a major service to the Agency in an area of activity that has chronically required attention. We are particularly impressed by the courage with which the report has identified deficiencies and the forthright manner in which recommendations have been drafted to bring the authority of management to bear on the solution of difficult problems. It is our impression that the statement of deficiencies can be regarded as generally valid. This memorandum is therefore directed chiefly at the proposed restatement of recommendations, which we agree is necessary in order to effectively cope with the problems identified by the report.

2. In general we approve of the revised recommendations. The consolidation of related recommendations will reduce the total number and improve the focus. We favor the strengthening of the position of CGS to represent all producing offices in dealing with collectors, and we are pleased with the plan to accomplish this objective by coordinated action by the DD/I and the DDS&T. For similar reasons we support the proposal to create a Collection Guidance Advisory Group, composed of the deputy directors of the substantive offices in the two directorates. If employed imaginatively, such a group can provide CGS with the support from management needed to provide effective continued guidance to collectors. We note, however, that the convocation of a body at this

SECRET

level imposes the obligation on CGS to submit significant problems for discussion and to staff and develop these problems so that they can be effectively considered by the group.

3. As noted in the report the DCIDs related to priorities for collection have been ineffective in focusing collection on priorities of national security importance and have been used instead to justify excessive collection. We agree that reform is in order but we anticipate that the road to reform will be difficult to follow without strong support from top management. If an advisory group is established one of its early topics for discussion might well be consideration of the proper roles for human source collection under present and expected capabilities for technical collection. Another subject which merits attention is the improvement of communications and feedback between analysts and collectors.

4. Although we favor tightening of control over the requirements process in order to cope with the information explosion, we do not look with favor on diverting larger amounts of analyst time to routine support activities. We are thus pleased that in the revised draft provision for a program of collection guides has been toned down to provide for the selective issuance of comprehensive collection guides. We would favor limiting this type of activity to priority subjects appropriate for human source collection where there is a good prospect of developing controlled assets.

5. ORR agrees that support from division and office management is needed to develop a streamlined and effective collection guidance system but we also believe that these objectives can be achieved most efficiently if a means can be found to improve control without burdening management with the review of large numbers of individual requirements. We note with satisfaction that the revised recommendations instruct Chief, CGS to devise such a system.

151 Bill Morell  
WILLIAM N. MORELL, JR.  
Director  
Research and Reports